UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/826,006	04/15/2004	James R. Braig	OPTIS.084A	9205	
20995 7590 01/11/2007 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP					
2040 MAIN ST	REET	RAMILLANO, LORE J			
FOURTEENTH IRVINE, CA 92			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1743		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
31 D.	AYS	01/11/2007	ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 31 DAYS from 01/11/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

	·			<u>ih/</u>		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/826,006	BRAIG ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Lore Ramillano	1743			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apported to the property of the prop	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addres	is		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e. cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this commuNBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 C	October 2005.				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application		•			
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)⊠	Claim(s) 1-36 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
• •	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er e				
,	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		by the Examiner.			
.0/	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			.121(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
۵,	1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	•		ge		
	application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* 9	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies no	t received.			
Attachmen		A) []	Summon (DTO 442)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date			
3) Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5)	Informal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 1743

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-15, drawn to an analyte detection system for detecting more than one analyte, classified in class 436, subclass 50.
 - II. Claims 16-20, drawn to a device for measuring a concentration of an analyte in a material sample, classified in class 422, subclass 58.
 - III. Claims 21-27, drawn to a method for measuring concentrations of a plurality of analytes in a single sample, classified in class 73, subclass 861.04.
 - IV. Claims 28-36, drawn to a method of determining a medical condition using analyte detection system, classified in class 436, subclass 164.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Groups I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and have different designs, modes of operation, and effects because both inventions do not have any overlapping structural limitations and the invention of Group I detects analytes, whereas, the invention of Group II measures the concentration of an analyte.

Inventions of Groups III and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as

Art Unit: 1743

claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process, such as a method for analyzing glucose in a blood sample.

Inventions of Groups IV and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process, such as a method for analyzing glucose in a blood sample.

Inventions of Groups III and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process, such as a method for performing electrochemical analysis with minimal size samples.

Inventions of Groups IV and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or

Art Unit: 1743

(2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process, such as a method for performing electrochemical analysis with minimal size samples.

Inventions of Groups III and IV are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect because the invention of Group III measures the concentration of analytes in a sample and does not require an optical source to conduct such measurement, whereas, the invention of Group IV determines a medical condition and requires a specific type of detection system, which comprises an optical source. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

2. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1743

3. A telephone call was made to David Jankowski on 12/6/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

- 4. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.
- 5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1743

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lore Ramillano whose telephone number is (571) 272-7420. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lore Ramillano Examiner Art Unit 1743

1/6/07

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700